

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC §102 and 35 USC §103. These objections and rejections are fully traversed below. In addition, Applicant has amended the claims to correct various typographical errors and to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claim 35 has been amended in response to the rejection under 35 USC §101. Claims 2 has been cancelled. Claim 38 has been added. Claims 1, 3-38 are now pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23, 26, and 35-37 under 35 USC §102(b) as being unpatentable over Nielsen, U.S. Patent No. 6,339,437, ('Nielsen' hereinafter).

Each of the independent claims has been amended to recite:

displaying the scroll bar by applying the one or more display criteria to the plurality of one or more locations of the scroll bar corresponding to the one or more desired locations in the file, wherein the scroll bar is generated such that the plurality of locations of the scroll bar indicate relative importance of contents in the corresponding locations of the file.

Nielsen discloses that "it is preferred that either the scroll thumb itself or the entire scroll bar have its color changed to reflect the amount of relevance detected at a given scroll thumb location." See e.g., col. 6, lines 52-55. Thus, a location of the scroll bar thumb must be determined. See e.g., col. 5, lines 47-53. In other words, the information that is displayed

depends upon the current location of the scrolling thumb on the scrollbar. See e.g., col. 1, lines 33-38.

In contrast, the claimed invention applies display criteria to a plurality of locations of the scroll bar, wherein the scroll bar is generated such that the plurality of locations of the scroll bar indicate relative importance of contents in the corresponding locations of the file. Since the display of Nielsen depends only upon the location of the scrolling thumb on the scrollbar, the scroll bar of Nielsen cannot indicate relative importance of contents of a plurality of locations of the file. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Nielsen fails to anticipate the pending claims, as amended.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references. In addition, it is submitted that the dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons. For example, with respect to claim 3, as amended, the scroll bar includes a plurality of horizontal segments, each of the horizontal segments indicating relative importance of contents in the corresponding locations of the file. The Examiner cites col. 6, lines 49-55. However, this section of Nielsen merely indicates that the scroll thumb or the entire scroll bar may have its color changed to reflect the amount of relevance detected at a given, single scroll thumb location. In other words, the relevance of only a single location can be indicated in Nielsen. Thus, Nielsen fails to disclose or suggest a plurality of horizontal segments, where each of the horizontal segments indicates relative importance of contents in the corresponding locations of the file.

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further-discussed as the above-discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §102.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 24 and 25 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of Eick, U.S. Patent No. 5,644,692, ('Eick' hereinafter).

The Examiner admits that Nielsen does not expressly teach obtaining user-defined background display criteria. Applicant respectfully asserts that Eick fails to cure the

deficiencies of the primary reference. As such, the combination of the cited references would fail to operate as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 24 and 25 are patentable over the cited references.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 27-29 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen and McGee et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,990,496, ('McGee' hereinafter)

The Examiner admits that Nielsen does not expressly teach wherein locating one or more desired locations in the file according to the location criteria includes determining a reference count for each row in the file, the reference count indicating a number of the desired locations in the corresponding row.

The Examiner seeks to cure the deficiencies of Nielsen with McGee. McGee discloses a system and method for automated classification of text by time slicing. See title. A text classifier controller reads text having one or more keywords contained within one or more story segments within the text. The text classifier controller identifies keywords within each line, and, in response to identifying at least one keyword within a line of text, classifies that line of text as a part of a story segment within the text. See col. 2, lines 36-42. Classification of text of individual story segments may be used to categorize video segments so that the categorized video segments can be selectively retrieved at later times. See col. 1, lines 10-14.

Even if Nielsen and McGee were combined, the display of the scroll bar would only correspond to a single scroll thumb location. Thus, in order to ascertain the relevance of each of the locations of the scroll bar, a user would have to use the scroll thumb to scroll through the scroll bar. However, at any given time, the display would only indicate the relevance of the current scroll thumb location.

The claimed invention enables a user to ascertain the relevant importance of various locations in the file without scrolling through the scroll bar. More particularly, the scroll bar is generated such that the plurality of locations of the scroll bar indicate relative importance of contents in the corresponding locations of the file. As a result, a user may easily determine a desired location in a file in order to scroll to that location. Thus, the claimed invention is advantageous over the cited art.

Moreover, with respect to claims 27-29, by determining a reference count for each row in the file, it is possible to generate a scroll bar to indicate the relevant importance of contents in the corresponding locations in the file. While McGee discloses classifying lines of text as part of a story segment, the combination of the cited references fails to disclose or suggest determining a reference count for each row in a file in order to generate a scroll bar such that the plurality of locations of the scroll bar indicate relative importance of contents in the corresponding locations of the file. Rather, the combination of McGee with Nielsen would merely result in classifying the corresponding lines, while modifying the display corresponding only to the current scroll thumb location. Accordingly, the combination of the cited references would fail to operate as claimed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 30 and 31 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen, McGee and Mohan et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,970,881, ('Mohan' hereinafter)

Applicant respectfully asserts that Mohan fails to cure the deficiencies of Nielsen and McGee. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 30 and 31 are patentable over the cited references.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 32-34 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen, McGee, Mohan and Kline, 'Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling,' ('Kline' hereinafter)

Applicant respectfully asserts that Kline fails to cure the deficiencies of Nielsen and McGee. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 32-34 are patentable over the cited references.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over

the cited references. In addition, it is submitted that the dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further-discussed as the above-discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103.

SUMMARY

An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. APL1P301).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP



Elise R. Heilbrunn
Reg. No. 42,649

PO Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100